I am in favour of the proposal set out in para. 5 rather than that in para. 4, since in addition to the arguments there expounded, I feel that the emended name CHRYSOPSINAE is a better-sounding and more easily pronounced name than CHRYSOPAINAE or CHRYSOPAIDAE.

By F. M. Carpenter (*Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*)

I am writing to lend my full support to the proposal of Mr. Bo Tjeder that the International Commission use its plenary powers to validate CHRYSOPIDAE and CHRYSOPINAE in their accustomed sense in the order Neuroptera. I also endorse the several other proposals submitted by Mr. Tjeder in connection with the foregoing recommendation.

The identity of the subfamily names based upon the genus *Chrysopa* Leach, on the one hand, and *Chrysops* Meigen, on the other, will continue to cause confusion until action is taken by the International Commission. The history of this nomenclatural problem certainly indicates that, with *Chrysopa* the type-genus of the family CHRYSOPIDAE, no confusion would follow the acceptance of the genus as the type-genus of the subfamily CHRYSOPINAE. On the other hand, the adoption of the subfamily name CHRYSOPAINAE for the genus *Chrysopa* would be certain to cause difficulties for many years. The dipterous name CHRYSOPINAE has not had nearly the extensive use that the corresponding name has had at both family and subfamily level in the Neuroptera.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL TO REJECT *MITRA PERLATA* [RÖDING], 1798 (GASTROPODA). Z.N.(S.) 1726

(see volume 22, page 334)

By Harald A. Rehder (*Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Dr. R. Tucker Abbott has shown me the comments he has made regarding the application in question by Mr. Walter O. Cernohorsky, and I agree with his statements.

It seems indisputable that *Mitra perlata* Röding, 1798, is a *nomen nudum*, since Röding does not cite any figures. As Abbott points out, the " process of elimination " —a dubious method at best—cannot be used here because Röding, after bestowing the name *Mitra imperialis* on Gmelin's α variety of *Voluta pertusa*, gives two names: *Mitra perlata* and *M. capucina* to varieties of Gmelin's species, but in neither instance does he use " var. β ", so we do not know if either or any of them are meant for this variety.

The rules for *nomina nuda* should be strictly adhered to, and this is particularly important in the case of the *Museum Boltenianum*, which contains many new names used by Röding for varieties of Gmelin's names, without being characterized or defined in any way.

Thus it appears that this application needs no action by the Commission, other than to declare that this case falls outside of their sphere of operation.

By Jean M. Cate (*Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.*)

I wish to go on record as supporting this request, for the same reasons stated in the petition.

Furthermore, as a worker in this family-group, I have on file well over 2500 names used in Mitridae by numerous authors in this family subsequent to Röding, and although the file is not yet complete, it does cover the more significant post-Linnaean works in Mitridae, and the name *Mitra perlata* does not appear in the file.

There are, however, numerous references, with adequate figures, to *Mitra chrysostoma* Broderip, 1836, and the species is well known by this name in important collections all over the world.

It would seem proper to suppress the name *Mitra perlata* Röding, 1798, on the basis of these findings and the arguments set forth by Mr. Cernohorsky in his petition.